DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 280 FL 018 527

AUTHOR Zhang, Xiaolin
TITLE Survey of TESOL Preparation Programs in the U.S.
PUB DATE Mar 90
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English To Speakers of Other Languages (24th, San Francisco, CA, March 6-10, 1990).
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Design; *English (Second Language); Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Language Teachers; *Program Design; Surveys; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS United States

ABSTRACT

A survey of training programs for teachers of English as a Second Language is presented. The survey focused on 177 graduate level ESL teacher education programs. The study categorized 177 graduate-level programs into three groups. Over 1,300 different course titles occurring 2,567 times across the programs are integrated in 27 areas that are later reorganized into more general categories of conformity with those representing the competency objectives of the English-as-a-Second-or Other-Language (ESOL) teacher education programs in the Guidelines for the Certification and Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) in the United States. The program's admission criteria and program requirements are also studied. Findings are quantified and tabulated for clear presentation and cross comparison. A discussion of the results in light of the guidelines and research in TESOL teacher education concludes the paper. (MSE) (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Literacy Education)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED331280

SURVEY OF TESOL PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN THE U.S.

Paper Presented at the 24th Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, March 6-10, 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Xiaolin Zhang

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Xiaolin Zhang
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

FL018527

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SURVEY OF TESOL PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN THE U.S.

Twenty years ago, in May 1970, more than thirty TESOL leaders from across this country met in Washington, D.C. at the TESOL Guidelines Conference, joining their wisdom and efforts in the adoption of the Guidelines for the Certification and Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages in the United States (Henceforth, the Guidelines). The birth of the Guidelines marked a more advanced stage in the growth of professionalism in the cause of TESOL. It has since rendered service to the nation's TESOL profession in two major ways: first, providing guidance for the specification of ESOL teacher state certification standards; second, providing guidance for the design and evaluation of TESOL professional preparation programs (Norris, 1972). It is in light of the second function that the present survey was conducted.

The TESOL profession has undergone a fast and exciting development in the United States as well as the world over. James Alatis (1987), citing the findings of Charles Blatchford's 1972 survey of the state departments of education for their requirements for ESL teachers, points out that at the time of the survey only two states had formulated specific ESOL requirements. In 1989, however, thirty-six states have a certificate of endorsement in the field of TESOL. In the meantime, M.A. level teacher education programs in ESL/EFL, which numbered only 12 in 1966, increased to 120 in 1986 according to

the Directory of Professional Preparation Programs in TESOL in the United States: 1986-88, along with 18 doctoral programs, 25 Bachelor's programs, and 33 certificate programs, adding up to 196 in total. By 1989, the number had further risen to 245, including 30 doctoral programs, 151 Master's programs, 26 Bachelor's programs, and 38 certificate programs, showing an increase of 25% during the three years since 1986.

In the face of such rapid expansion of the profession, it is necessary for the sake of its future healthy growth to make a synchronic examination of the nation's currently active TESOL preparation programs to find out how well they conform to the standards set forth and defined in the Guidelines; among the five instructional components specified in Section C of the Guidelines, which ones have received greater attention; and finally, what aspects of an ESOL teacher's academic and professional competencies are given greater emphasis. Answers to these questions will contribute to a clearer conception and more realistic evaluation of the current trends and academic/professional quality of the profession in the U.S.

The present survey attempts to supply such answers by examining the 177 graduate level programs listed in Julia Frank-McNeil's Directory of Professional Preparation Programs in TESOL in the United States: 1986-88 [Henceforth,Directory(1986)]. The Directory(1986) provides rich resources for studies in issues of our concern. However, it does not integrate and categorize the data to reveal national trend of the profession. Besides, there

are a few inaccuracies as to the number of programs at different levels resulting from either inconsistent editing principles or inadvertent negligence (e.g., the Pennsylvania State University does not have a doctoral program according to the program description but is included in the list of institutions with programs leading to a Doctor's degree; Corpus Christi State University and the University of Houston, Clear Lake both offer two degrees: a B.S. and an M.S. degree in Education . But only the latter is listed twice as an institution with dual programs while the former appears just once in the list of institutions having programs leading to a Bachelor's degree). However, it is not the task of this survey to comment on the Directory(1986). The point of mentioning the inaccuracy lies solely in justifying my counting of the programs which is slightly different from what is given by the Directory(1986).

My survey categorizes the 177 graduate level programs under study into three groups, i.e., the doctoral, Master's, and certificate programs respectively. Over 1300 different course titles occurring 2567 times across the programs are integrated into 27 areas, which are later reorganized into more general categories in conformity with those representing the competency objectives of the ESOL teacher education programs in the Guidelines. The programs' admission criteria and program requirements are also studied. Findings are quantified and tabulated for clear presentation and cross comparison. A discussion of the results in the light of the Guidelines and

recent research in TESOL teacher education concludes the paper.

Before reporting on the survey, however, it is necessary to highlight a few points central to the Guidelines. Respectively, the three sections of the Guidelines "define the role of an ESL teacher in an American school, describe the personal qualities and professional competencies the teacher should possess, and describe the features of a professional preparation program designed to fulfill those competencies" (Kreidler, 1987, p.3).

William Norris, who revised the Guidelines and gave it its present shape, indicated in his speech "Teacher qualifications and preparation: Guidelines for TESOL/US" (1972) that Section B, which comprises the eight essential teacher qualifications, is the central "core" of the document. Without the specification of these qualifications, the successful performance of the teaching role stated in Section A of the Guidelines would be reduced to an empty slogan whereas TESOL preparation programs across the nation would be running a hit or miss business, with no unified standards such as those identified in Section C for their design and evaluation

Specifically, in order to qualify as an ESL teacher, the TESOL practitioner is expected to possess certain personal qualities so as to interact successfully in the classroom with his students as humans (Qualification 1); to be proficient in English and have experience of learning another language as well as another culture (Qualifications 2 and 3); to possess knowledge of linguistics and English linguistics, and of psycholinguistic

and socio-cultural variables in language learning (Qualifications 4 and 5); to understand and demonstrate ability to apply the principles and techniques in language pedagogy, second language assessment, and materials and curriculum evaluation (Qualifications 6 and 7); and finally, to be well informed of the fundamentals of cultural anthropology (Qualification 8).

These qualifications are cross referenced in Section C, which, according to Norris (1972), is "the longest and fully detailed part" organized into five main components: (1) Academic specialization; (2) Pedagogy; (3) Another language; (4) Evaluation of candidates; (5) Staff and facilities.

It might be obvious that the first three components concern the curriculum contents of an ESL preparation program which relate directly to the development of the prospective ESL teacher's academic/professional competencies. The latter two components are more of an administrative nature, concerning the evaluating policies, criteria, and instruments for admission to, retention in and completion of the program (Component 4), and the provision and maintenance of qualified training personnel as well as adequate resources of curriculum and professional reference materials (Component 5). Consequently, standards specified in the first three components provide a useful frame of reference for my examination of the course offerings of the programs under study. Component 4 necessitates and gives direction to my study of the program requirements and requirements for admission listed in the Directory(1986), although they do not contain all

the information needed for a complete assessment of this particular aspect of the programs. The last component, however, despite its instructional and administrative importance in the preparation of qualified ESL teachers, is quite beyond the limit of the present survey's data base. Consequently, I was unable to cover the fifth component, focusing, however, on the curricular patterns of the programs in question.

The crucial areas of concentration in the curriculum of ESL preparation programs (cf., Components 1, 2, and 3) are ingeniously represented by Alatis (1974) with his acronym LAPSE. Table 1 below summarizes Alatis' own interpretation of the acronym.

Insert Table 1 about here

In agreement with Alatis, Kreidler (1987) claims that "Studies in English linguistics, anthropology, psychology, and sociology, as well as in education, form the special areas of preparation for the ESL teacher" (pp.3-4).

It is probably not difficult to discern the fine correlation Alatis himself indicated between his LAPSE acronym and Section C of the Guidelines. Table 2 below shows the match.

Insert Table 2 about here

With the correlation between the LAPSE acronym and the five

main components, especially Components 1, 2, and 3, it may be justifiable to use the acronym as an additional organizing device in the integration and categorization of my data besides the framework provided by the Guidelines itself.

Having reviewed the central statements of the Guidelines which form the basis of my study, I now turn to the report of the survey itself.

Source of Data

The present survey is an improvement and expansion of my previous study conducted in 1987 when the Directory(1986) was the only source available that provides the most up-to-date and the fulliest detailed information about the TESOL professional preparation programs in the U.S. In spite of the current availability of the latest edition of the Directory [Henceforth, Directory(1989)], I decided to hold on to the older edition mainly for practical reasons.

The task of integrating and categorizing thousands of bits of new information entailed by the expansion of survey population has been incredibly time-consuming, not counting the time and effort spent in re-examining the old data , making whatever alterations necessary for a more rationalized and unified categorization within the newly introduced framework of the Guidelines. By the time the Directory(1989) became available, I had almost completed collecting my data. I could not afford to go over the listings of the 177 programs in the new edition of

the Directory, which might contain all kinds of alterations, besides working on the 50-odd newly listed programs.

With the Directory(1986) as my source of data, it is only too fair to limit the significance of whatever trend my survey may reveal to a time period from 1986 through 1988. In the meantime, however, I do not believe any radical changes have taken place in the trend of the nation's TESOL profession since then. Probably, we may all agree that nothing revolutionary in Kuhn's sense has since occurred in TESOL and TESOL-related fields in this country.

Population

Altogether 177 graduate level TESOL preparation programs offered by 135 institutions in the U.S. were surveyed. A program is counted as such if it is distinct from others in all the following three respects:

1) Name of degree/certificate;

2) Program requirements;

3) Course offerings.

Table 3 shows the range of the population.

Insert Table 3 about here

Results

Findings of the survey covering the first three instructional components identified in Section C of the Guidelines are summarized in Table 4 below.

Insert Table 4 about here

One of my categories, i.e., the category of "Research", subsumes topics about the foundations and methods of bibliographical and both qualitative and quantitative research in almost all the areas of academic specialization and pedagogy. For one reason or another, maybe because of its pervasiveness, maybe because of its secondary importance to the other competencies more central to the ESL teacher's successful achievement of the objectives of his teaching role, the competence in research is not explicitly indicated in the Guidelines' statements about the eight essential qualifications. The category of "Research", therefore, with 99 occurrences across the programs, does not have a place to fit in in Table 4.

The "Others" category contains courses unable to be put under the major categories. However, I was able to group related courses in this all-inclusive category to form subcategories. Some of them have already appeared in Table 4. The rest of them are as follows, with numbers to indicate their occurrences:

a) ESL Supervision/Administration	8
b) Literary Studies	52
c) Writing/Rhetoric	6
d) History	2
e) Philosophy	2
f) English	12

g) Communication 14

h) Comps/Thesis Related Studies 15

i) Seminar/Colloquium/Independent Study 12

j) Miscellaneous Titles 35

Table 5 rearranged the course offerings in an descending order of frequency of occurrence.

Insert Table 5 about here

If we add up the numbers of occurrence of all the courses under each category of the first three instructional component in Section C of the Guidelines (cf., Table 4), we can obtain the results tabulated in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 about here

So far, we have treated the 177 programs as a whole. In fact, courses in a particular area of concentration were not found to have equal distribution across the three types of programs. Table 7 summarizes such differences among the doctoral, Master's, and certificate programs.

Insert Table 7 about here

As we did in Table 6, we can integrate the course areas into categories given by the Guidelines. See Table 8 for the

results.

Insert Table 8 about here

With the results given in Table 8, we are able to compute the proportion of each course area in the total number of course offerings in the curricula of each program type, as is shown in Table 9.

Insert Table 9 about here

Besides examining the curricula of the programs, I also studied their program requirements and requirements for admission listed in the Directory(1986). All the programs I have surveyed provide explicit statements on these issues although some of them are rather brief, which is understandable or even appropriate in view of the limited space. I computed the average length of, and the average number of credits required by, each type of the programs. I also worked on the number of programs requiring English proficiency, competence in a foreign language, practice teaching, comprehensive examination, and a thesis. Results are tabulated in Table 10.

Insert Table 10 about here

Discussion

My data show that the standards set forth in the Guidelines have generally been followed by the nation's currently active TESOL professional preparation programs. Table 6 and 10 demonstrate that the four instructional components aiming at overlapping academic/professional competency objectives are present in the programs surveyed. However, it is also obvious from the survey results that attention has not been equally given to all components alike.

From Table 6, one can see that courses of the first component "Academic specialization" account for 61.2% of the total, 1.6 times more than those of "Pedagogy", the second component, which consists of 37.8% of the total course offerings. Courses offered to achieve competency objectives specified in these two components constitute 99% of the entire curriculum. The third component, i.e., "Another language", has only an unfair and negligible share of 1%.

It can be concluded from the results that "Another language", which relates directly to Qualification 2 in Section B of the Guidelines, is a neglected area across the nation's TESOL programs. Of the 272 course offerings in the curriculum of doctoral programs, only 2 are Foreign Language courses (0.7%). For Master's programs, the proportion of such courses is just 1.1%, with 20 offerings against a total of 1828. In the curriculum of the graduate certificate programs, the figure is null. Combining the results shown in Table 10 concerning the

programs' requirements about competence in foreign languages, we find that about half of the doctoral programs, more than a third of the Master's programs, and 67% of the graduate certificate programs do not attach importance to this qualification.

Another weak link revealed by the survey concerning Component 4 (cf., Table 10) is the programs' requirement about English proficiency (Qualification 2). While the majority (84%) of doctoral programs uphold this professional standard, a quarter of the Master's programs and four out of ten certificate programs do not.

Practice teaching is yet another weak area in today's American TESOL programs. Almost 80% of the doctoral programs do not have this requirement. One third of both the Master's and certificate programs also overlook this important area of training. It is true that Teaching Practicum ranks among the top five most frequently offered course areas. Nevertheless, a close look at my data reveals that the 120 occurrences in this area are contributed by only 98 programs (55%). Almost half of the survey population do not offer such courses. If we further discriminate among the three types of programs, we can find the startling fact that over two thirds (69%) of the doctoral programs, more than four out of ten Master's programs (43%), and over one third of the certificate programs, do not include Teaching Practicum courses in their curricula.

In a recent article, Richards and Crookes (1988) contend that most M.A. TESOL programs listed in the Directory(1986)

"attempt to achieve a balanced curriculum emphasizing both theory and practice. However, theory sometimes wins out over practice" (p.9). Findings of my survey give support to their claim. Exclusion of practice teaching from the program requirements and of Teaching Practicum courses from the curriculum by half of the population reflects a tendency in the American profession of ESOL teacher education to neglect the importance of the "applied" part of Qualification 6 in the Guidelines.

Some other trends have become manifest from my findings. Table 5 shows that ESOL teacher education programs across the nation have laid greater emphasis on Linguistics (N=418) and Methodology (N=367) as two major constituents of their curricula, with one representing a knowledge base and the other forming the center of a practical component (cf., Richards, 1987). Other titles on the top of the list in Table 5 also attract our attention as the nation's most frequently offered, hence most important, TESOL training courses. Nevertheless, Linguistics and Methodology outnumber the other three course areas among the top five by 2.6-3.5 times. Among the top ten, they exceed the others by 2.6-5 times.

Table 7 helps us see the presence of a national consensus across the three types of programs concerning the importance of the three course areas, i.e., Linguistics, Methodology, and Grammar. Consensus seems also existent between doctoral and Master's programs as to the importance of Psycholinguistics,

Language Acquisition, and Sociolinguistics. On the other hand, Master's and certificate programs agree in the extent of their emphasis on Testing/Evaluation and Teaching Practicum. It seems that doctoral and Master's programs tend to share interest in knowledge-based Component 1 courses whereas certificate programs are attaching much greater importance to Component 2 courses which are more practical and pedagogical in nature. Supportive evidence for this claim can also be found in Table 8.

Research as a course area manifests sharp differences between the doctoral programs and the other two types of programs. In terms of number of occurrence, it ranks No.3 among the 30 course areas with the doctoral programs. Its place goes down, however, to No.10 with the Master's programs, and even lower to No.11 with the certificate programs. In terms of mean number of occurrence, the doctoral programs offer twice as many such courses than the Master's programs and more than three times as many as those of the certificate programs.

It is probably owing to this difference that the Ph.D students in Ochsner's (1980) job-related survey of former M.A. in TESOL graduates rated their M.A. training less favorably than others, especially with respect to their research skills.

One last point that needs to be mentioned is that the eight essential qualifications, which constitute the "central core" of the Guidelines, are found not to have received equal attention. Besides the tendency to neglect Qualifications 2, 3, and 6 already discussed above, there is evidence of inadequate

attention to Qualifications 7 and 8, as is shown in Table 6. Compared with the overweight of 1a, 1b, and 2b, 1c (Culture and society) and 2c (Second-language assessment) have only a marginal place in the TESOL curriculum.

To sum up, the cause of TESOL in the U.S. is prosperous and promising. With its growth in size, it has become more and more professionalized. My survey of the 177 graduate level ESOL teacher education programs in the United States has evidenced the general acceptance of the standards specified in the Guidelines. Nevertheless, my data indicate that about half of the TESOL preparation programs fall short of two established standards concerning the instructional components of "Another language" and "Language teaching practicum" whereas almost one third of the programs do not make explicit requirements about English proficiency. It is also found out that the academic and professional competencies identified in the Guidelines are not equally emphasized. The knowledge base of the curriculum tends to outweigh the practical component, a manifestation of the persistent problem stemming from the dichotomy of theory and practice, to which so many people have been trying to find a solution. Evaluated in the light of the Guidelines, there is much room for improvement in the academic and professional quality of the American TESOL preparation programs.

REFERENCES

Alatis, J. E. (1974). Towards a LAPSE theory of teacher preparation in English as a second language. ELT Journal, 29(1), 8-18.

Alatis, J. E. (1987). The Growth of professionalism in TESOL and the prospects for the future. TESOL Quarterly, 21(1), 9-19.

Frank-McNeil, J. (1986). Directory of professional preparation programs in TESOL in the United States: 1986-1989. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Guidelines for the certification and preparation of teachers of English to speakers of other languages in the United States. (1976). Washington,D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Kre dler, C. (1987). ESL teacher education. ERIC Digest.

Norris, W. E. (1972). Teacher qualifications and preparation: Guidelines for TESOL/US. (ERIC Document REproduction Service No. ED 060 698)

Ochsner, R. (1980). Job-related aspects of the M.A. in TESOL degree. TESOL Quarterly, 14(2), 199-207.

Richards, J. C. (1987). The dilemma of teacher education in TESOL. TESOL Quarterly, 21(2), 209-226.

Richards, J. C., & Crookes, G. (1988). The practicum in TESOL. TESOL Quarterly, 22(1), 9-27.

Table 1 The LAPSE acronym

Acronym	Area of Concentration	Courses/Topics
L	Linguistics	Introduction to Linguistics Phonetics and Phonemics Morphology and Syntax Contrastive Analysis
A	Anthropology	Cultural Anthropology Language and Culture
P	Psychology	Psycholinguistics Psychology of Language Acquisition
S	Sociology of Language	Sociolinguistics Social, Regional, and Functional Varieties of English
E	English	History of the English Language and Literature English Structure: Phonology* English Structure: Morphology and Syntax*
	Education	Language Pedagogy TESL Methodology: Theory and Practice TESL Methodology: Materials and Techniques Techniques of Second Language Teaching Supervised Practice Teaching Demonstration Observation Peer Teaching Foreign Language Assessment The Teaching of Reading and SLA

* These courses would be included if they had not already been taken care of in the general phonetics and phonemics, and morphology and syntax courses under linguistics.

Table 2 Correlation between the LAPSE acronym and Section C of the Guidelines

Instructional Components in Section C of the Guidelines	The LAPSE Acronym
1. Academic specialization	
a. Linguistics and English linguistics	L & E(nglish)
b. Pscholinguistics and sociolinguistics	P & S
c. Culture and society	A
2. Pedagogy	
a. Professional education	E(ducation)
b. Second language pedagogy	E(ducation)
c Language teaching practicum	E(ducation)
3. Another language	L & A
4. Evaluation of candidates	
a. English proficiency	E(nglish)*
b. Policy, criteria of evaluation for admission to, retention in and successful completion of the program	LAPSE*
c. Appropriate instruments for assessing the candidate's achievements;	LAPSE*
Availability of assessment results;	LAPSE*
Certification based on such assessment	LAPSE*
5. Staff and facilities	
A staff superior in the competencies outlined in Section B;	LAPSE*
Maintenance of up-to-date curriculum and professional reference materials;	LAPSE*
Close contacts with programs as sites of teaching practicum	E(ducation)*

*Indicates indirect correlation.

Table 3 Range of the Population Surveyed (N=177)

	Doctoral Programs	Master's Programs	Certificate Programs
Number listed in Directory(1986)	19	131	33
Number surveyed (graduate level)	19	131	27
Number of institutions involved	17	121	25

Table 4 Contents of the Curricula (N=177)

Area of Concentration	Cross Reference to Section C	My Category	Number of Occurrence
L, E	1a	Linguistics	418
		Grammar	133
		Phonetics/Phonology	142
		Morphology	11
		Syntax	66
		Semantics	32
		History of English	51
		Contrastive/Error Analysis	49
A	1c	Culture	104
		Others: Anthropology	12
		Others: Sociology & Political Science	6
		Others: Ethnic Studies	4
P	1b	Psycholinguistics	75
		Language Acquisition	26
		SLA	70
		Others: Psychology	15
S	1b	Sociolinguistics	104
		Language Variation	17
		Bilingual Education	79
E	2a	Education	93
		Educational Psychology	7
	2b	Methodology	367
		Teaching Reading	42
		Teaching Writing	42
		ESP	22
		Curriculum/Materials/ Media	98
	2c	Testing/Evaluation	83
	2d	Teaching Practicum	120
L, A	3	Foreign Languages	22

Table 5 Course Areas in Descending Order of Frequency of Occurrence

Place	Course Area	N of Occurrence (N=2532)	%
1	Linguistics	418	16.50
2	Methodology	367	14.49
3	Phonetics/Phonology	142	5.61
4	Grammar	133	5.25
5	Teaching Practicum	120	4.74
6	Culture	104	4.11
	Sociolinguistics	104	4.11
7	Research	99	3.91
8	Curriculum/Materials/Media	98	3.87
9	Education	93	3.67
10	Testing/Evaluation	83	3.28
11	Bilingual Education	79	3.12
12	Psycholinguistics	75	2.96
13	SLA	70	2.76
14	Syntax	66	2.61
15	Others: Literary Studies	52	2.05
16	History of English	51	2.01
17	Contrastive/Error Analysis	49	1.94
18	Teaching Reading	42	1.67
	Teaching Writing	42	1.67
19	Semantics	32	1.26
20	Language Acquisition	26	1.03
21	ESP	22	0.87
	Foreign Languages	22	0.87
22	Language Variation	17	0.67
23	Others: Psychology	15	0.59
	Others: Comps/Thesis Related Studies	15	0.59
24	Others: Communication	14	0.55
25	Others: Anthropology	12	0.47
	Others: English	12	0.47
	Others: Seminar/Colloquium/ Independent Study	12	0.47
26	Morphology	11	0.43
27	ESL Supervision/Administration	8	0.32
28	Educational Psychology	7	0.28
29	Others: Sociology/Political Science	6	0.24
	Writing/Rhetoric	6	0.24
30	Others: Ethnic Studies	4	0.16
31	History	2	0.08
	Philosophy	2	0.08

Table 6 Number of Occurrence of Each Area of Concentration in the Curricula (Total N of occurrence=2310)

Area of Concentration	N of Occurrence	%
1. Academic specialization	1414	61.2
a. Linguistics and English linguistics	902	39.0
b. Psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics	386	16.7
c. Culture and society	126	5.5
2. Pedagogy	874	37.8
a. Professional education	100	4.3
b. Second-language pedagogy	571	24.7
c. Second-language assessment	83	3.6
d. Language teaching practicum	120	5.2
3. Another language	22	1.0

Table 7 Distribution of Course Offerings across the Three Types of Programs

Course Area	Distribution Doctoral(N=19) Total	Mean	Master's(N=131) Total	Mean	Certificate(N=27) Total	Mean
Linguistics	48	2.50	314	2.40	56	2.10
Grammar	15	0.80	95	0.70	23	0.85
Phone/Phono*	12	0.60	115	0.90	15	0.55
Morphology	2	0.10	8	0.06	1	0.04
Syntax	6	0.30	55	0.40	5	0.20
Semantics	3	0.16	27	0.20	2	0.07
History of English	7	0.37	39	0.30	5	0.20
Con/Err* Analysis	3	0.16	42	0.30	4	0.15
Psycholinguistics	10	0.50	60	0.46	5	0.20
Lg* Acquisition	3	0.16	21	0.16	2	0.07
SLA	15	0.80	48	0.40	7	0.26
Psychology	1	0.05	14	0.10	0	0.00
Sociolinguistics	11	0.60	79	0.60	14	0.50
Lg Variation	4	0.20	13	0.10	0	0.00
Biling* Education	5	0.26	64	0.50	10	0.40
Culture	9	0.47	74	0.56	21	0.80
Anthropology	0	0.00	12	0.09	0	0.00
Soc/Poli* Science	0	0.00	7	0.05	0	0.00
Ethnic Studies	0	0.00	4	0.03	0	0.00
Education	13	0.70	76	0.58	4	0.15
Edl* Psychology	2	0.10	5	0.04	0	0.00
Methodology	39	2.10	266	2.00	62	2.30
T* Reading	3	0.16	32	0.24	7	0.26
T Writing	8	0.40	31	0.24	3	0.11
ESP	2	0.10	5	0.04	15	0.55
Curr/Mat*/Media	13	0.68	78	0.60	7	0.26
Testg*/Eval*	8	0.40	61	0.50	14	0.50
T Practicum	9	0.47	92	0.70	19	0.70
Foreign Lgs	2	0.10	20	0.15	0	0.00
Research	19	1.00	71	0.50	9	0.30

* Phone/Phono: Phonetics/Phonology
Con/Err: Contrastive/Error
Lg: Language
Biling: Bilingual
Soc/Poli: Social/Political
Edl: Educational
T: Teaching
Curr/Mat: Curriculum/Material
Testg: Testing
Eval: Evaluation

Table 8 Integrated Data from Table 7

Area of Concentration	Distribution Doctoral(N=19) Total	Mean	Master's(N=131) Total	Mean	Certificate(N=27) Total	Mean
1a	96	5.10	695	5.30	111	4.10
1b	49	2.30	299	2.30	38	1.40
1c	9	0.50	97	0.70	21	0.80
2a	15	0.80	81	0.60	4	0.15
2b	65	3.40	412	3.20	94	3.50
2c	8	0.40	61	0.50	14	0.50
2d	9	0.50	92	0.70	19	0.70
3	2	0.10	20	0.15	0	0.00
Research	19	1.00	71	0.50	9	0.30

Table 9 Relative Weight of Course Areas in the Curricula of the Three Types of Programs

Area of Concentration	Doctoral Number	%	Master's Number	%	Certificate Number	%
1a	96	35.3	695	38.1	111	35.8
1b	49	18.0	299	16.4	38	12.3
1c	9	3.3	97	5.3	21	6.8
2a	15	5.5	81	4.4	4	1.3
2b	65	24.0	412	22.5	94	30.3
2c	8	2.9	61	3.3	14	4.5
2d	9	3.3	92	5.0	19	6.1
3	2	0.7	20	1.1	0	0.0
Research	19	7.0	71	3.9	9	2.9
Total	272	100.0	1828	100.0	310	100.0

Table 10 Results concerning Component 4

	Length (Semester)	Credits	English Proficiency	Foreign Lg	Practice Teaching	Comps	Thesis
D*	9.6	61.4	16 (84%)	10(53%)	4(21%)	19(100%)	17(89%)
M*	4.1	36.4	98 (75%)	85(65%)	90(69%)	74 (56%)	36(28%)
C*	2.7	15.6	16 (59%)	9(33%)	19(70%)	3 (11%)	0(0%)

*D=Doctoral Programs, M=Master's Programs, C=Certificate Programs